EQUAL RIGHTS

Vol. 31, No. 3 MAY - JUNE, 1945

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SERIAL RECORD JUN 12 19

The World Charter

By ALICE MORGAN WRIGHT

SAN FRANCISCO, May 8, 1945.

IN A HEAVY rainfall on the afternoon of April 24th, the dauntless chairman and officers of the National Woman's Party foregathered at the Washington airport to bid God-speed to its delegates who were leaving for the Conference of the United Nations.

Like a silver arrow the great Stratoliner sprang upward through the gathered storm into a sunny sky and started on its westward way.

A white expanse of foamy cloud beneath us hid the earth's surface to its uttermost rim and this remote but encircling horizon embraced the world of people who were to be affected through all time by the wise determination and by the mistakes which would be made at the coming Conference where the assembled representatives would be able to bring to their conclusions no wisdom greater than human wisdom. The thought was pregnant with dismay, but in my mind hung like a talisman this verse seen on the wall of a children's library:

> "The world spreads out on either side
> No wider than the heart is wide."

State after state rolled itself up like a map: fields, and cities and rivers briefly glimpsed through the distant clouds. The sun slipped down around the earth and up again behind us and, far below, the mesas of New Mexico reddened in the dawn. The mile-wide meteor crater appeared as if hollowed out by a pebble and the mile-high battlements and turrets which stand above the rampaging Colorado River were flattened.

The mountain ranges were again filled with cloud and again we passed over a ruffled sea. Its stationary billows lifted against crags which were the peaks of high mountains. They appeared, not like breaking waves in motion, but like still pictures of breaking waves, since the drift of cloud was too slow to be perceived.

Then we were over the real ocean, the Pacific—may its name be a prophesy!—and in San Francisco. The map of the Continent had been rolled up. It was April 25th.

As the first amusing, confusing days of the Conference passed, exhilaration and depression were alternate states of mind and many were the self-addressed queries as to whether the business of building security for the world was ever going to get under way and the cornerstone of justice and equality be laid at the base of it. Gradually, however, glimpses appeared like those of solid earth through rifted cloud and it became apparent where this thing and that thing might be steered through into place.

The four golden columns between which the blue light falls on the Conference hall make a stage fit for giants; yet the human figures playing their roles upon it are not belittled since the roles are felt to be great.

The work assigned to the Woman's Party members here transcends our work for the equal rights amendment to the United States Constitution and places us among those whose mission it is to establish the basic principle of equality for men and women throughout the world.

The approach to ultimate ends differs always as to method. In our quest for constitutional and legal equality by means of the amendment we believe that the right way is the direct way. It seems to us that while we are seeking an entrance by the front door, many fine and able women are making their approach by devious ways through the back gardens, round about and back and forth, dallying in the by-paths of State legislation, although our goal, the ultimate good which we all seek is the same.

Some of us think that a law is good if it does some good. Some of us consider that it is not good unless it is built on the rock of the federal amendment instead of on the shifting sands of state legislation.

Likewise, opinions of delegates from the different nations differ according to their forms of government and the social and economic progress already achieved by their people. Delegates from democratic Norway hold that equality of the sexes should be taken for granted. While they do not object to the statement of the basic principle in the body of the Charter they would object, for example, to making specific demands for equal opportunities of employment in the secretariat of the organization, believing that to ask for equality of treatment would imply lack of security under the law. England sends a splendid Charter, which includes the statement "Men will gain equally with women if women take a full share in building the future, for this the maximum effort of both is needed. . . . As citizens: the right to equal status with men and full democratic expression; the opportunity to vote, to serve on committees, juries and public bodies whether national or international."

Australia has a still more forthright document which comes from the hand and from the head and heart of her delegate, Mrs. Jessie Street, surely one of the greatest champions of women not only in Australia but in the world. It "affirms the need for the immediate application of equality as between men and women in all laws and regulations."

Another of the most distinguished and ablest, most sincere and devoted workers in the cause of women is Miss Bertha Lutz of the Brazilian Delegation, who claims among fundamental rights: "Women to be assured full political, civil and nationality rights; direct participation in government, the administration and diplomatic representation."

Thus differences which sometimes seem as high and insurmountable as canyon walls flatten themselves out in perspective from above and become a smooth pattern of an archetypal design. The demands for equality by women all over the world differ superficially but not substantially from our own which may be stated briefly:

(Continued on Page 31)

The Amendment In The Senate

By CECIL NORTON BROY
Political Chairman, National Woman's Party

ON Thursday, May 3, the Equal Rights Amendment was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator George L. Radcliffe of Maryland at 2:30 p. m. as Senate Joint Resolution No. 61. The proposed Amendment as presented by Senator Radcliffe, reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

""This Amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification."

The following Senators were announced by Senator Radcliffe as co-sponsors of the Amendment: Homer E. *Capehart* (R), Indiana; Arthur *Capper* (R), Kansas; Albert B. *Chandler* (D), Kentucky; Dennis *Chavez* (D), New Mexico; Homer *Ferguson* (R), Michigan; J. William *Fulbright* (D), Arkansas; Joseph F. *Guffey* (D), Pennsylvania; Albert W. *Hawkes* (R), New Jersey; Hiram *Johnson* (R), California; Harley M. *Kilgore* (D), West Virginia; William *Langer* (R), North Dakota; John L. *McClellan* (D), Arkansas; Warren G. *Magnuson* (D), Washington; Francis J. *Myers* (D), Pennsylvania; Claude *Pepper* (D), Florida; Edward V. *Robertson* (R), Wyoming; Tom *Stewart* (D), Tennessee; Elmer *Thomas* (D), Oklahoma; John *Thomas* (R), Idaho; James M. *Tunnell* (D), Delaware; Millard *Tydings* (D), Maryland; Raymond E. *Willis* (R), Indiana; Milton R. *Young* (R), North Dakota.

For long weeks before the Amendment was introduced, gloom seemed to pervade the Senate reception room each time we discussed the Amendment. We were told that it might not be introduced at all during this session since there was a movement to bar all constitutional amendments for the duration of the war. However, it is always darkest before the dawn. A thorough and reliable man, Senator Radcliffe, of Maryland, had undertaken to act as our chief sponsor and he did not falter. Senator Radcliffe and his splendid secretary, Miss Bertha Joseph, a member of the National Woman's Party, set about the task of talking to every Senator who, they thought, might want to help. This made already busy days all the busier for Senator Radcliffe and Miss Joseph. Finally the day scheduled for the introduction of the Amendment, Thursday, May 3, arrived and the Amendment was placed before the Senate in spite of the determined efforts of our opponents.

In addition to the twenty-four sponsors a number of the most respected men in the Senate assured Senator Radcliffe of their intention to support him by speaking for the Amendment on the floor of the Senate. These included Senator Warren Austin of Vermont, who had made the favorable report to the Senate in the last Congress, and Senator Walter George of Georgia.

A delegation of nearly forty prominent Maryland women came over from Baltimore and other parts of Maryland to hear Senator Radcliffe. The delegation was escorted to the Senate Family Gallery according to directions from Senator Radcliffe's office.

Promptly, at the scheduled time, Senator Radcliffe arose from his seat and in clear and distinct tones introduced the measure with the speech quoted below. As soon as the Maryland Senator had finished, Senator Guffey of Pennsylvania spoke and then from the Republican side Senator Langer of North Dakota stood up and promised his full support. Following the speeches the proposed resolution was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

After the speeches the Maryland delegation of women went to the Senate Reception Room to thank the Senators for the auspicious starting of the Amendment on its way in the Senate. They were accompanied by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Congressional Chairman of the National Woman's Party, and by myself as Political Chairman.

Senator Radcliffe's speech to the Senate was as follows:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, on behalf of various Senators and myself, a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment providing that the rights of women and men shall be co-equal.

I feel strongly that the adoption of this amendment would be a forward step and a wise one. Its adoption would certainly be one of the most important stages in the development of opportunities for women. Of course, I realize that for many years in countless indispensable ways women have had many varied fields of usefulness which they have utilized for the benefit of humanity. However, ever-changing economic factors and processes have made constantly more urgent the demand that women be given the right to exercise certain other privileges which have so far in a measure been denied them. It may be that economic conditions of other days did not make imperative that such rights and privileges exist in a full sense. Nevertheless for many years women have given unmistakable and entirely convincing evidence that they are entitled to equality of opportunity with men and that society in the broad sense of the term would be greatly benefited by the exercise of women of such rights.

Women Competent

The wholesome trend toward such a realization has received a tremendous impetus because of and during the progress of the present World War. The tragic intensity and all-comprehensiveness of our war program have found women not only willing but also ready and competent to do a large part in the fight for freedom and democracy. Their contribution on the home front and on the battlefield during the present war has been outstanding and indispensable.

We are reminded that equality of opportunity will call also for equality of responsibility. Certainly so, but both terms in

EQUAL RIGHTS

Official Organ of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.

Published Bi-Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second class matter at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Subscription $1.50 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $2.00

ANNA KELTON WILEY . . . . . Editor
DORA G. OGLE . . . . . Business Manager

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

ALMA LUTZ — INEZ HAYNES IRWIN
EDITH HOUGHTON HOOKER — HELEN ROBBINS BITTERMANN
MIRIAM E. OATMAN, Ph. D.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

The National Council of the N. W. P. consists of the officers, past Chairmen, the Chairman of each of the State and Territory branches and the D. C., the Chairmen of the Occupational Councils and twenty Members at large.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

Chairman, Alice Paul, N. J.
1st Vice-Chairman, Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio
2nd Vice-Chairman, Margaret C. Williams, Conn.
3d Vice-Chairman, Jane Norman Smith, Vt.
Treasurer, Laura M. Berrien, Ga.
Secretary, Dr. Margaret Sebree, D. C.

Mrs. Ethel Adamson, N. J.
Mrs. Nina Allender, Ill.
Mrs. Estelle Bjerg, Ariz.
Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va.
Mrs. Lois Buenzli, Pa.
Miss Rosa Cunningham, Iowa
Mrs. Serena Foley Davis, Pa.
Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes, Md.
Miss Edith Goode, Vt.
Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger, Md.
Mrs. Rebecca Greathouse, La.
Mrs. U. S. Guyer, Kan.
Miss Alma Lutz, Mass.
Mrs. Burnita Shelton Matthews, D. C.
Mrs. Charles L. McNary, Ore.
Mrs. Perle S. Mesta, Ariz.
Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pa.
Miss Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Miss Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. Helen Hunt West, Fla.
Mrs. Anna Kelton Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. Lucy Rice Winkler, Cal.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

OBJECT

To secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships—in particular to secure the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification."

application are relative as to persons concerned, whether men or women. As individuals, whichever our sex, we can avail ourselves of our opportunities and also meet our responsibilities only as our physical fitness, special talents, other facilities, and circumstances will permit.

Protective Legislation

Some people fear that by the adoption of this amendment women may be deprived of certain necessary protective legislation now existing which was enacted for their special benefit and was so designated. Certainly we should be sufficiently resourceful to guard against injurious results occurring, bearing in mind the fact that opportunity and responsibility should be considered really from the standpoint of each individual and not from the standpoint of sex. I feel confident that with the adoption of an equal rights amendment the availability of individuals, whether they are men or women, to exercise specific duties, or to sustain successfully demands of responsibility, can be regulated with increasing success. We will continue to seek that goal at which no one, man or woman, will be forced to attempt to do that for which there is neither mental qualification nor physical fitness.

It is obvious that the adoption of an equal rights amendment may require changes in certain existing remedial legislation. Surely adequate legislation designed to suit individual needs and limitations can be framed and passed. A period of moratorium is provided in this proposed amendment during which the most obvious requirements for enactment of legislation can be satisfied. Further legislation can and doubtless will be passed from time to time as conditions seem to warrant and to require.

I hope and believe that an amendment creating equal rights for men and women will become the law of the land.

Senator Guffey then followed:

Mr. President, several years ago I announced my support of the Equal Rights Amendment and I am still heartily in favor of it.

Further, since both parties favor it by unanimous vote in their party platforms, I can see no possible reason for delay.

A number of our allies have already granted equality under the law to women (China, Russia, San Salvador among them).

Why should the United States, now winning the war through the aid of millions of women, withhold this justice any longer?

There may be excuses for not passing this amendment, but there are no valid reasons. I beg the Senate to act quickly.

Senator Langer followed:

Mr. President, lest there be any misunderstanding insofar as the proposed Equal Rights Amendment is concerned, I wish the Senate to know that there are just as many Republican sponsors of the proposed amendment as there are Democratic sponsors of it. I wish to make it perfectly plain that in the Committee on the Judiciary, at the time when the measure was being considered by it, the Republican members of the committee were just as anxious to have it reported favorably as were the Democratic members. I venture the prophesy that when the measure comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate, there will be just as many Republican votes for it, proportionately, as there will be Democratic votes. Personally, I wish to say at this time I intend to give it my whole hearted, enthusiastic, and unqualified support.

The tide seems to have turned in favor of the Amendment. It is my sincere belief that it can pass in this Congress. For the first time the Amendment is out of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. We have a majority pledge in the Senate Judiciary Committee. President Truman has announced his support of the Amendment. Both political parties are committed to it through their party platforms. The legislature of one of the greatest States in the Union, New York, has just memorialized Congress to pass the Amendment.

This should be the banner year for the equality movement. Let us, each one, leave no stone unturned to make it so.

The World Charter

(Continued from Cover)

In this day when civilization's whole structure is shaken to its foundation and the human race, if it is to survive, must bring to the shaping of its destiny a sounder judgment and a fuller measure of that wisdom with which we believe our spiritual heritage endows us, there must be a fundamental change in the order of human affairs. Without having had equal responsibility with men for this present cataclysm, women have taken their share of its burdens and have suffered equally with men in its dire consequences.

That our future may be built on a firmer foundation and hold a fairer hope for human happiness, its direction must reside henceforth in the equal jurisdiction of men and women. In the Charter which shall establish peace and security for the people of the world, the constitutional equality of men and women must be inviolable. In the code of the World Court equal constitutional and legal rights must be inherent and any Bill of Rights adopted must admit no discriminations based on sex.

The preparation by UNCIO of the world charter has been and must be constantly and alertly scrutinized lest some item, phrase or word may be left out or put in which in the time to come may militate against the complete fulfillment of the principle of equality or weaken its safeguards.

The clauses which have thus far been agreed upon by the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China as amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are as follows:

Under Sec. 3 add after "problems"

"And promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion or *sex*."

Chap. V, Sec. B. The General Assembly, functions and powers.

After "social fields" add "To assist in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, language, religion or *sex* and also for the encouragement of the development of international law."

Chap. 9, Sec A. After "fundamental freedoms" add

"For all without distinction as to race, language, religion or *sex*."

It will be seen that these amendments do not by any means cover all of the contingencies, but the Charter is still open to additional amendments, and the strong support given to those already included is encouraging.

In Mr. Molotov's statement at his press conference today he said:

"The Soviet delegation attaches the greatest importance to the following amendment adopted at the consultations of the Four. * * * Chap. 1. Purposes . . . now provides for the encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, creed or *sex*."

In the preamble as drawn by Field Marshal Smuts, whose words best of all express the high purpose for which this Conference of Nations was called, has for its second paragraph:

"To re-establish faith in fundamental human rights, in the sanctity and ultimate value of human personality, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

Today is V-E day and the radio says that once again on that island in the harbor of New York our big bronze girl holds in her lifted hand a lighted torch.

House Committee Favorably Reports The Amendment

By ANITA POLLITZER
Vice-Chairman, Congressional Committee, National Woman's Party

AN important victory for the Equal Rights Amendment has been won. Following the unanimous favorable report of its sub-committee the House Judiciary Committee, on April twenty-fourth, voted to report the Amendment favorably to the House of Representatives.

This is the first time in the history of the Amendment that the House Judiciary Committee has reported this measure favorably. The vote was 15 to 7. The Amendment, therefore, goes before the House of Representatives with the real support of the Committee behind it.

Only those who have worked with the Committee, lobbying members of Congress day in and day out, or doing spade work for the Amendment in their own States, can appreciate the effort it has taken to bring about this single but necessary step, and the extent of the victory won.

For several days before the vote, some of us had talked with the Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, and had asked that at the next meeting of the full Committee, the Equal Rights Amendment be brought up and acted upon favorably, now that the sub-committee had reported. Their replies made us feel more secure. This time, there were no excuses and dodgings. Our chief concern, therefore, was to be certain that Committee members in favor of the Amendment would be present at the meeting, and would press for the vote.

We arrived at the Capitol early on the day of the Committee meeting and went to the widely separated offices of Committee members in the two House Office Buildings. We re-checked our poll, and learned that friends of the Amendment would be present and were hoping to take the vote.

Before ten-thirty, the hour of the Committee meeting, we gravitated from all directions to the hall adjoining the Judiciary rooms. Somehow this day you felt there was magic in the air. We did not see one opponent lobbying against us in the offices or in the corridors. I have sat in that outer room, again and again through the years, but this time it was different. We felt as we waited that good work had been done; that the Representatives were voting in accordance with the pledges in their platforms, and the sentiment in their districts; and we were confident that at last—for the first time in twenty-two years—the Amendment would be approved by this Committee which must act before the House can receive a proposed Constitutional Amendment.

After what seemed quite a time, the Committee door opened, and the first members to leave the room filed past us saying cheerily: "It's over"—"You can be happy now." Then Representative Fadjo Cravens, of Arkansas, member of the Committee and sponsor of the Amendment, greeted us with news of the victory.

> *"After the favorable report, the Judiciary Committee authorized representatives of the Committee to take all necessary steps to bring the Equal Rights Amendment before the House before action. Those members of Congress who have supported the Amendment for so long are gratified that a favorable report has at last been obtained. We are now looking forward to the day when the Congress will take similar favorable action," he said.*

Then Representative Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who had presided at the meeting, received us in the Committee room, and formally declared:

> *"The Judiciary Committee, after most mature consideration extending over a long period of time, has reported the Equal Rights Amendment favorably by a vote of 15 to 7."*

Congressman Zebulon Weaver, of North Carolina, Chairman of the sub-committee which had given a unanimous report, a sincere friend of the measure, took this occasion to tell us:

> *"I am very happy that this great forward step for justice and equality has been taken today."*

Representative John M. Robsion, of Kentucky, long a champion of the Equal Rights Amendment, expressed his pleasure at the substantial majority received. He said:

> *"Congress should without delay submit to the States for ratification this Amendment granting equal justice under the law."*

It was really a scene of mutual rejoicing. The Congressmen who had voted for the Amendment seemed proud of their votes. The fifteen members of the Judiciary Committee who voted favorably were: Democrats—Representatives Zebulon Weaver, of North Carolina; John Tolan, of California; William T. Byrne, of New York; Joseph R. Bryson, of South Carolina; Fadjo Cravens, of Arkansas, and Frank L. Chelf, of Kentucky; Republicans—Representatives Clarence E. Hancock, of New York; John M. Robsion, of Kentucky; Chauncey W. Reed, of Illinois; Louis E. Graham, of Pennsylvania; Raymon E. Springer, of Indiana; Joseph E. Talbot, of Connecticut; Frank Fellows, of Maine; Earl R. Lewis, of Ohio, and Angier L. Goodwin, of Massachusetts. Voting against the favorable report, either in person or through their proxies, were: Representatives Sam Hobbs, of Alabama; Emanuel Celler, of New York; Sam M. Russell, of Texas; Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio; John W. Gwynne, of Iowa, and John Jennings, Jr., of Tennessee. Those absent were Representatives Francis Walter, of Pensylvania, because of a Congressional trip to Europe; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Martin Gorski, of Illinois, and Earl C. Michener, of Michigan. Presiding: Representative Hatton W. Sumners, Chairman.

In addition to the Representatives whose quoted statements show their splendid stand, special mention should be made of Representatives Chauncey W. Reed, of Illinois, and Angier L. Goodwin, of Massachusetts, members of the sub-committee, who gave effective aid.

National Woman's Party members who helped at the Capitol on the day of the vote were Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Congressional Committee; Miss Marie T. Lockwood, Delaware State Chairman; Mrs. Nora Stanton Barney, N. Y., Chairman of the National Advisory Committee; Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va., Chairman Political Committee; Dr. Margaret Sebree, Ky., National Secretary; Helen Hunt West, Florida, member National Council; Evelyn Kennison, Mass., Chairman of Membership Committee; Dora Ogle, Maryland; Caroline Lexow Babcock, Alice

Morgan Wright and Anna Jane Phillips, New York; and myself. Directing the campaign was Alice Paul, National Chairman.

Helen Hunt West came all the way from Jacksonville, Florida, the week before the vote to help. She took upon her shoulders a major part of the responsibility for the work with the sub-committee. After the favorable sub-committee action she rendered invaluable service in final interviews with the members of the full Judiciary Committee, many of whom were old friends from the time when she was actively at work in our campaign in Washington.

Others who rendered great service at the Capitol prior to the day of the vote were Mrs. Amelia Himes Walker, of Baltimore, Chairman of our Lobby Committee, and Mrs. Elizabeth Forbes, of Baltimore, an indefatigable member of the Lobby Committee.

Every woman there had her own vivid memories, I am sure, as we awaited the result of the Committees' deliberations. Some thought of the years that had already gone into preparation for the passage of the Amendment, of which this was a step—of all the legal research and the trips to speak at meetings—of the last year's favorable report by the Senate Judiciary Committee—of the fact that both parties were pledged to the Amendment.

As I awaited the Committee's verdict during the executive session, my thoughts went back to the innumerable people who have given years of devotion to forwarding this measure. I thought of the years of her life which Maud Younger, when Chairman of our Congressional Committee, had given to the work, and the miles and miles of corridors at the Capitol which she had walked and which women are still walking to win equality of rights under the law. I thought of Senator Curtis, of Kansas, later Vice-President, who was the first to introduce our Amendment in the Senate. I thought of Representative Daniel R. Anthony, of Kansas, nephew of Susan B. Anthony, and my visit to his home in Kansas in 1923 to ask him to be the first Congressman to introduce the Amendment. His reply was: *"Equal rights for men and women—that is what I was brought up to believe and have believed in all my life."*

I thought of Representative U. S. Guyer, former ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, who told me shortly before he passed away that he would endeavor to get a favorable report at every Judiciary Committee meeting until the measure was passed, and of the fact that Mrs. Guyer had gone on our National Council, and is now co-chairman with Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, of our Congressional Committee.

I thought with gratitude of Representative Louis Ludlow of Indiana. This is the eighth successive Congress in which he has introduced the Amendment. At first he was its sole sponsor. This year he was joined by 73 co-sponsors in the introduction of the Equal Rights Amendment, and nine Representatives introduced separate identical bills, among them House Joint Resolution 49, which was favorably reported by the Committee.

But most of all, as I waited, my thoughts went back to two meetings—held in Seneca Falls, New York—which have determined the course of the woman movement. The first, on July 21, 1848, when the first Woman's Rights Convention ever held in the world, declared for *complete equality for women with men*—in the law—the franchise—and in all fields.

The second, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of that early meeting, was held on July 21, 1923. At this meeting, Alice Paul, leader of the Woman's Party, as she had been during the Suffrage campaign, presented the following resolution:

> *"Be it resolved, that in order to bring the complete equal rights ideal to the victory that was won for suffrage, we undertake the securing of an Amendment to the United States Constitution. . . ."*

I remember so well that at least a dozen of us arose, simultaneously, in different parts of the meeting, to second this Resolution. And then I remember, and it is also in the 1923 volume of Equal Rights, that Miss Paul then said:

> *"We shall not be safe until the principle of Equal Rights is written into the framework of our national government."*

These words express the real significance of this Judiciary meeting. Much work has gone into the winning of this first House report.

That afternoon there was a trip to the airport by a group of us to wish Godspeed to our three delegates, off to San Francisco, to urge recognition of the principle of equality for women. Alice Paul gave out the following statement:

> *"It is a matter for rejoicing that just as women are leaving for San Francisco to urge equal rights for women on a world scale, members of our own Congress have acted in this decisive way to extend equality for women here at home. This action by the powerful House Judiciary Committee will have a far-reaching effect—not only in lifting the status of American Women, but in furthering the effort to write equality for women into the charter of any new world organization."*

The many women who, through united effort, have brought the Judiciary victory to pass, will instantly begin the next task. A rule must be obtained from the Rules Committee, in order to call up the Amendment for a vote in the House of Representatives. This had to be done in our Suffrage and in our Equal Nationality campaigns. We have long learned that no step for the Amendment is easy, so word should go to members of the Rules Committee at once. The platforms of both parties have declared for submission of the Amendment. Passage of the Amendment is now a matter of honor and of faith in the principles for which our nation has declared.

Members of the Rules Committee of the House, who have it in their power to take prompt action on a Rule for the Equal Rights Amendment are: Representatives Adolph J. Sabath, Chairman, Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; J. Bayard Clark, N. C.; John J. Delaney, N. Y.; William N. Colmer, Miss.; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; Roger C. Slaughter, Mo.; Leo E. Allen, Ill.; Earl C. Michener, Mich.; Charles A. Halleck, Ind., and Clarence J. Brown, Ohio.

We know that victory is certain. A great writer once expressed the thought that nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come.

Eastern Regional Conference

Claridge Hotel, Atlantic City, New Jersey

June 2 and 3

All members of the National Woman's Party Welcome

ALMA HARRISON AMBROSE,
Maryland State Chairman.

The Story Of The Brees Resolution (1943-45)

By JEANNETTE MARKS
Chairman New York State Branch National Woman's Party

TWO young middle-aged people, a man and a woman, Orlo Marion Brees and Margaret A. Moore, played the chief parts in the development of the *Brees Resolution.* The man is a veteran from World War I, and the woman holds a responsible post in the Supreme Court in Binghamton. Mrs. Moore is small in stature, and her lovely young face is clear-cut in feature, her temperament intense. Orlo Brees, poet and legislator, has a fine brow, wears glasses and looks you straight in the eyes. He is a graduate of Brown University, a "graduate" editor, too, of a New York State newspaper, and an Assemblyman in the New York State Legislature.

Mr. Brees and Mrs. Moore met and fell into a discussion of equal constitutional status for women—a meeting followed by correspondence. On September 25th, 1943, Mr. Brees wrote Mrs. Moore: "Frankly, I was amazed to learn that the rights of American women are abridged in so many ways and in so many of our States. . . . Freedom of choice in a wide field of individual decision is the outstanding characteristic of the American way of life, and surely our women are as much entitled to the rights and responsibilities of American citizens as are the men."

To Mr. Brees Mrs. Moore replied: "I, too, have been amazed at the lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of many well informed people of both sexes, of the inequalities and discriminations which now exist against women under the various State statutes, and I consider it not only a privilege, but my duty to take an active part in seeing to it that 'freedom' shall also include the legal recognition of equal rights for women." . . .

A few weeks later in a letter to me Mr. Brees wrote: "I expect to introduce a resolution memorializing Congress to act favorably on the Equal Rights Amendment. I shall probably introduce it either next week or the week following." Besides those cited in the Resolution, Mr. Brees had many arguments. First and foremost among the arguments not directly mentioned was his conviction that the Labor opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment was based on the fallacy that women should enjoy protective legislation in industry. I suppose Mr. Brees felt swiftly what it takes some of us, even women who suffer the consequences, a long time to learn, that so-called "protection" for either a self-respecting woman or a self-respecting nation too often represents expediency, and—well or—ah well: The old wolf story we listened to as children, "the better to eat you with, my dear!"

Then came a wire from Mr. Brees in Albany dated January 31, 1944:

> PLAN TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTION IN ASSEMBLY. WILL PROBABLY MAKE STATEMENT TONIGHT. WILL SEND YOU COPIES OF BOTH. ORLO M. BREES

On this night Mr. Brees gave a fine introduction to Equal Rights in a brief talk about Susan B. Anthony and followed it with the now familiar resolution:

WHEREAS, The women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this nation, and

WHEREAS, They have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American republic and the ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom, and

WHEREAS, This nation was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal", and such declaration has no actual or implied limitations on equality before the law by reason of sex, and

WHEREAS, The rights of women before the law are much abridged in many states, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livelihood, and is a source of irritation and annoyance to many thousands of others who recognize in this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women which they have reached by their achievements in other fields of human endeavor; now therefore be it

RESOLVED (if the Senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to adopt and submit to the several states the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment is now pending before Congress, and be it further

RESOLVED (if the Senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerks of the House of Representatives and to each member of Congress elected from the State of New York.

On that night of January 31, 1944, Mr. Brees met with enthusiasm and applause. For a while it seemed as if the resolution having had such a favorable reception was destined to have quick right of way. We of New York State believed that the step Mr. Brees was about to take was not only important in itself but also deeply important in the precedent it would set for action by other States. It was with little delay the Brees Resolution went on into the Rules Committee. Speaker Heck and members of the Rules Committee without the aid of WHO'S WHO came to know some of us from the New York State Branch rather well—no doubt there were moments when it seemed to them they knew us too well! The first push was over. We worked. We waited well on into the year of 1944. Silence reigned.

Then began to come into the New York State office a question repeated in many different ways, and this inquiry came from all over the State: "Does anybody know what is holding up the Brees Resolution?" Some of us did. The trouble was Jane Todd's fine bill for Equal Pay for Equal Work. Naturally Miss Todd was anxious to have that bill passed, and she was anxious to have it passed before the Brees Resolution was reported out. The Labor Unions were not opposing her bill, but she was afraid that they and some other organizations might oppose the Brees Resolution, and that there would be confusion about what could, erroneously, be called two Equal Rights Bills. You see, to parody the radio when it goes on the air about the food we eat, both Jane Todd's Bill and Mr. Brees's Resolution had "the delicate locked-up flavor" of Equal Rights, but were, nevertheless, like the Harvard definition of a college faculty—made up of mutually repellent particles!

Some members of our group had begun to feel that we were getting the "brush off" and said so. Others had seen defeat from the very beginning—psychologically a position which, if taken, is in itself defeat. But we continued to wait and we did not explode as I understand self-respecting atoms under pressure have the right to do. Instead, anxiously Mr. Brees yielded to Miss Todd's request to give the Equal Pay for Equal Work precedence upon her assurance that she would use her influence when her bill became a *fait accompli*

to have the Brees Resolution reported out of the Rules Committee.

The closing hours of the 1944 session of the Legislature were so crowded that no legislator on the floor could possibly have kept track of the developments.

Mr. Brees met Miss Todd and in passing asked her: "What about the Resolution?"

Her reply was: "We are not going to get it."

Many imaginary reasons were given for this defeat. At that time Mr. Brees' statesmanship was splendid, for he did not find fault and he did not admit failure. Now we do not regret that year of postponement. Action on the Brees Resolution was deferred but we made friends. We had, however, to see the Legislature close on March 18th, 1944, with seemingly nothing accomplished towards the memorializing of Congress.

Another year had come and on January 11, 1945, I wrote Mr. Brees that in thought day after day I was asking him this question: "Should we not now go ahead with the Equal Rights work in the New York State Legislature?" . . . Enclosed were some papers for him, for I had been engaged in a little campaign of my own in northern New York State. Then came the reply dated January 27, 1945: "I am planning to reintroduce the resolution as it was presented to the Legislature last year, and hope to have it ready to do so next week, in order to press for action at the same time as last year. . . . This time there should be nothing in the way to block favorable action and I trust we shall be successful in passing the resolution."

Mr. Brees' belief that we should be able to get action in 1945 was I suppose in part based on the fact that both political parties had Equal Rights planks in their party platforms. Some of the rest of us knew, too, that from all over New York State, to quote from an old Methodist hymn, "showers of blessing" had been poured down upon the Governor, Irving Ives, Senator Feinberg, Speaker Heck and others, asking for their support of Mr. Brees' Resolution. We knew that at the end much would depend upon Speaker Heck's presentation. All of these men are university men and all Republicans. All hold honorary degrees, and every one of them is in the upper brackets of principle as well as of education—a composite picture which catches the attention. We jump at once to the conclusion that the Brees Resolution was a "party" achievement. No, not at all; as we shall see it was not that in any sense of the word but something far larger.

To close our story happily, thanks to the bi-partisan and unanimous responses of the New York State Legislature, to its sense of fairness and to its independence, Mr. Brees on Saturday night, March 24th, at the closing session of the New York State Legislature, was able to send the New York State office this official telegram: "RESOLUTION JUST PASSED ASSEMBLY WITHOUT DISSENTING VOTE." The Brees Resolution on which Mr. Brees, Margaret Moore, the groups throughout New York State and your Chairman had been working for three years had passed unanimously —unanimously in the Legislature, unanimously in the Senate. . . .

How much common sense—and Tom Paine attributed many virtues to that!—entered into the unity of both parties of the New York State Legislature I do not know. Most of the Legislators must have known what the *Herald-Tribune* in one of its brilliant Equal Rights editorials put so well, that when defining rights and assigning responsibilities it "is harder to be unfair than to be fair" and that in these days it would be a pity to take the devious road of unfairness! Yet, for twenty-two years in our Federal Government the House of Representatives had taken the "difficult road" and has kept the Equal Rights Amendment—Equality of Rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex —in Committee and from discussion on the floor of the House. All the more honor to the fairness of New York State! . . . Our victory had been the strongest kind of victory it is possible to win in a Legislature—bi-partisan and non-political.

The freedom of women had been treated by the New York State Legislature as we treat any of the great principles of life, such as faith and love and justice. Again the principle of freedom had risen above sectionalism and politics, and our Empire State of New York had taken the first step forward in the national State by State movement to give women equality. Many of us believe that in life there are some principles and relationships which are by nature out of the domain of politics. Faith is one of those non-political principles—faith which makes us believe in the decency and courage of human beings to create a world fit to live in. Love, too, whether for a mother or for a child, is in experience and in action non-political. When we see a child in trouble, the most political among us does not care a tinker whether that child comes from a Democratic or a Republican family or is a boy or a girl. All we know is that we wish to help the child, even as we wish, whether we go to San Francisco or not, to help our world, for all of us, including Government at its best, are controlled by principles far more powerful than any Government on earth.

It is one of those principles out of the domain of politics, that of Justice, which has shaped every Federal amendment and every State law giving freedom to men and women. It is Justice, unless we desire punishment for humanity far worse than that Munich and its sadistic leader have brought the world, which makes it equitably impossible to plan for the freedom of those beyond our own shores and yet at home keep one-half of our own population, women, deprived of the rights of full citizenship and, therefore, of Freedom.

James A. Farley Endorses Amendment

May 4, 1945.

MISS ANITA POLLITZER,
Chairman, New York City Committee,
National Woman's Party,
542 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Dear Miss Pollitzer:

As I have been away considerably during the past few weeks, this is the first opportunity I have had to acknowledge your letter of the 17th, relative to the Equal Rights Amendment.

I am in favor of the passage of this Amendment and I sincerely hope and trust that it will be accomplished. I quite agree in your statement equal rights for women seem the logical conclusion of the Suffrage Amendment.

With my best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
Office of the Governor
Bismarck, North Dakota

May 9, 1945.

ALICE PAUL, *Chairman,*
National Woman's Party,
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, 2, D. C.

Dear Miss Paul:

It is a privilege and a pleasure to wholeheartedly endorse the Equal Rights Amendment now pending in Congress. This Amendment sets up a standard of justified equality for which we have been working for a long time.

(*Signed*) FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor of North Dakota.

Equality At San Francisco Conference

By NORA STANTON BARNEY

San Francisco, May 10, 1945.

We, the first three delegates of the National Woman's Party and the World Woman's Party to the San Francisco Conference, Alice Morgan Wright, Edith Goode, and 1, arrived by stratoplane on the opening day, April 25. The city was full to overflowing and the St. Francis and Fairmont Hotels a babel of all the languages of the five continents.

We were soon joined by Mrs. George Mesta, member of the National Council of the Woman's Party; Miss Mary Burt Messer, one of the founders of the Woman's Party, and Miss Mildred Taylor, former executive secretary of the California Woman's Party.

The problem of getting the Charter of Dumbarton Oaks amended so as to guarantee to women equality before international law and within the framework of the Charter seemed complex in the extreme. After a few days of orientation the paths to be followed seemed less obscure. The cause of no discrimination on account of race, creed, religion, or sex was being ably advocated by various good feminist delegates. Outstanding among them were Mrs. Jessie Street, Assistant Delegate from Australia; Miss Bertha Lutz, Delegate from Brazil, and Miss Minerva Bernadino, Delegate from the San Dominican Republic.

There was a very definite conviction in the minds of some delegations at first that equality as between men and women need not be mentioned, as it would be understood without mentioning it. That was the case with Norway. It was also the argument of the only woman on the American Delegation, Dean Virginia Gildersleeve. We pointed out to all that that was the mistake unfortunately made in drafting the Constitution of the United States, which sounded perfect until women found that they were only persons on occasion and not full citizens. We insisted that it was so much simpler to start right rather than to have the uphill task of subsequent amendments.

One week after the start of the Conference, Field Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, Head Delegate from the U. S. of South Africa, published his splendid suggestion for a Declaration of Principles to be embodied in the Charter, and in it he called for "equal rights for men and women." It called forth enthusiastic praise, and the hope and the belief that it would be adopted were almost universal.

But as we go to press, Mr. Stettinius is supposedly drafting a counter proposal based on the four freedoms. I am reminded of Lin Yu Tang's criticism, "We do not want freedom *or* or *from;* we want just *plain freedom.*"

For an amendment to get on the agenda of the Conference, it was necessary for a delegation to propose it. There was an element of haste in the whole conference that many delegates complained about. The Conference had convened on Wednesday, April 25, yet a deadline for introduction of amendments was set for a week from the following Friday midnight, which left only nine days for the stupendous task of framing the most important document in the history of the world, perhaps, and certainly one which should influence civilization for many generations to come. In spite of this haste, three delegations came out for amendments calling for equal rights for men and women; the Republic of San Domingo, the U. S. S. R., and Brazil. It was certainly unfortunate that the two great Anglo Saxon nations, the United States and the British Empire, did not lead instead of trailing behind, in this great movement of our century.

Nora Stanton Barney Visits Los Angeles

By RUTH M. SNYDER

Publicity Chairman, School Women's Council

Nora Stanton Barney, a delegate from the National Women's Party to the Conference at San Francisco, brought added inspiration and vision to workers for the Equal Rights Amendment in Los Angeles and vicinity. By the joint invitation of the California Branch of the National Women's Party, the School Women's Council and the Business Women's Legislative Council, Mrs. Barney was the guest of honor at several delightful meetings, where she was asked by earnest supporters of the Equal Rights Amendment how to set about to accomplish the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment by Congress.

Saturday, May 19, at 3:30 P. M., at a well-appointed tea at the modernistic May Company Wilshire tea room in Los Angeles, Mrs. Barney was introduced to an audience of one hundred school and business women by Dr. Zelma Huxtable, director of the California Branch of the National Women's Party. Sunday, May 20, Mrs. Barney was the guest of honor at a delightful garden party given at the home of the famous authoress, Mrs. Elizabeth Pickett Chevelier, in Altadena, California. At this garden party were many representatives of foreign lands, as Poland, Cuba, Persia, China, England and Santo Domingo.

The outline of the program at both affairs was very much the same, but to different audiences who differed widely in their interests. Dr. Wycliffe Stack, a teacher and brilliant attorney of Los Angeles, by way of introduction to the program, gave a clear talk upon the background of the cause and purpose of the Equal Rights Amendment. Then Dr. Zelma Huxtable introduced Mrs. Barney as the grand daughter of Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and also as an architect and engineer.

Mrs. Barney in her addresses pointed out definitely that women should take part in making the lasting peace. She herself is the author of a plan whereby the people of a nation shall vote upon their delegates to these conferences, relieving their government of making special appointees. All through her address ran the thread of women's alertness and that they should make themselves felt so that they would not have subservient places such as a sub-delegate or secretary, but that they should have the right to be a full delegate. In this instance, the case of Mrs. Street of Australia was cited. Her qualifications are splendid, but she was merely allowed the privilege of being an assistant delegate. It was brought out very clearly that women must raise their voice for rights in this world. When the roll call was given at the Conference for the countries favoring "Equality for Women," only three nations responded: Russia, Santo Domingo and Brazil! Mrs. Barney stated that women must do their part to build up the nucleus of a lasting peace, and a nucleus of public opinion to prove the nobility of peace and also to prove that peace will come.

Mrs. Barney stated that the World's Woman's Party had greatly benefited women all over the world. Norway had gained and kept her benefits. Chinese women have more political freedom than the women of the United States. The aim of the Equal Rights Amendment is not one of mere national interest but also one of international interest.

Mrs. Barney closed with the idea that our social destiny is in our hands and that it is wise for us to so guide it that we shall not have war.

Other honored guests were: Dr. Mary Sinclair Crawford of the University of Southern California; Lillian Burkhart Goldsmith, commentator and lecturer, and Dame Pankhurst.

Endorsements

UPSALA COLLEGE
East Orange
New Jersey

May 9, 1945.

MISS CAROLINE LEXOW BABCOCK,
National Woman's Party,
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

Dear Miss Babcock:

I am happy to reply to your letter of May 7.

If we Americans really mean "Democracy" when we say "Democracy," the inequality of rights under the law is out of the question. Democracy means equality of rights under the law. It is a confession of a specious interpretation of the word "democracy" when it is necessary to amend the Constitution in order to clarify this point. However, since this is so, by all means let us amend it so that it will be clear from now on.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANS ERICSSON,
Dean.

Words of Appreciation

Plainview, Texas, May 10, 1945.

HONORABLE HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Texas Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Sumners:

I have just learned of the action of the House Judiciary Committee in reporting the Equal Rights Amendment favorably, with the significant vote of 15 to 7.

You, as chairman of the committee, deserve congratulation for this fact, and I want you to know of my personal feeling of joy and pride in this accomplishment.

No doubt you know that the General Federation of Women's Clubs is on record as favoring passage of the bill. As a member of the Board of Directors of that organization, I want to assure you that the General Federation is greatly pleased to know that the bill has been reported. Texas members of the General Federation will feel an especial pride in your leadership.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. J. W. WALKER, *Past President,*
Texas Federation of Women's Clubs.

Equal Rights Forum in Albany

By ELIZABETH M. HINE
Chairman, National Woman's Party, for Albany County, N. Y.

Great interest in the Equal Rights Amendment was displayed by members of various Albany women's clubs at a Forum held on March 23, 1945, at the City Club of Albany. The forum was sponsored by the Zonta Club and the Business and Professional Women's Group of the City Club.

Speaking for the Equal Rights Amendment were Alice Morgan Wright, distinguished sculptor, member of the American Association of University Women, the City Club, and other Albany groups, and Anita Pollitzer, member of the Executive Committee of the National Woman's Party, who has taken a leading part in the suffrage and equal rights campaigns.

The audience stayed until a late hour discussing this vital question.

A Tribute To Mrs. St. Clair Thompson

By ELSIE M. HILL

The memory of Ella Clapp Thompson's service to the cause of justice for women helps us to go forward in the movement in which we have until now enjoyed her warm comradeship.

In December of 1912 there was assembled a woman's group in Washington, later known as the National Woman's Party, determined to raise the status of women in our country. Their immediate object was to write into the national constitution these words—"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." These words, awaiting action in Congress since 1878, were finally made to come alive as the supreme law of the land at the end of eight more years through the ever-increasing labor and service of women in all parts of our country. Suffrage for women was won. Mrs. St. Clair Thompson took a large part in bringing this victory to pass.

Mrs. Thompson was a Southern woman. She lived in the national capital at a time when the dominant political party of the South was in control of our national government. Whenever the situation called for the expression of suffrage sentiment from any other southern state, her tireless faith and gallant spirit made her willing to set out upon tedious journeys. She organized southern women to make their special contribution. She helped to win the support of southern leaders in Congress for the Suffrage Amendment.

The weary days of the suffrage campaign from 1912 to 1920 are forgotten in the demand of this present day that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." Ella Clapp Thompson is remembered by her comrades as a source of strength for the continuance of the work for equality to which she gave so much.

Women In The Church

By MARY FOWLER

"The Society for the Equal Ministry of Men and Women"—a representative British group of women church leaders, mostly of the Church of England—has taken new courage in its fight for the ordination of women by the news that the Anglican Church in China recently ordained a Chinese woman to the priesthood. They feel that this act by a member of their church family establishes a precedent whereby Anglican women in any country may eventually secure the right to ordination and admission into the ministry. Because of the shortage of ministers in Great Britain, due to chaplaincy demands, the subject is now being widely debated in church and political circles.

* * *

The ordination of a woman minister "for ecumenical work and the ministry of the written word" was recently conducted at the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City, with the approval of the New York City Congregational Church Association, the licensing body. The woman upon whom this unique distinction was conferred is Mrs. Elsie Thomas Culver, a Bachelor of Divinity from the Pacific School of Religion, and a publicist on the staff of the Church Committee on Overseas Relief and Reconstruction.

* * *

For the first time in history, the Church of England in Canada has named a woman as a chaplain's assistant. She is Deaconess Madeline Hawkins, now Lieutenant Hawkins of the Canadian Women's Army Corps. She will assist the Hon. Captain J. S. Neff, chaplain at the Corps' training station at Kitchener, Ontario.

* * *

A Japanese-American enlisted woman serves as chaplain's assistant at Fort Knox, Ky. Private Lillian Higashi joined the WAC and is assistant to Chaplain Emil J. Helseth, post chaplain. Private Higashi, a member of St. Matthew's Cathedral, Laramie, Wyoming, counsels with men in trouble, serves as stenographer, drives the Chaplain's car, projects motion pictures. She insists that she "likes people" and therefore loves her work. She was studying at the University of Wyoming to teach English, French and Spanish when the war changed her plans.

—From *"The Woman's Pulpit,"* Jan.-Feb., 1945.

Florence Bayard Hilles Library

MARY ELIZABETH DOWNEY, *Librarian*

On Sunday afternoon, May 20, a delightful Garden Party and Tea was held at Alva Belmont House by the Baltimore Council of Business and Professional Women of the National Woman's Party, when Miss Sarah Katzoff, Chairman of the Library Committee, presented a group of valuable books to the collection, supplementing their previous gift of "Women of Maryland."

Some fifty members of the Council were received by as many Washington members. The superb weather enabled the guests to enjoy the garden and the following program was given in the Florence Bayard Hilles Library. Mrs. Dorothy Shipley Granger, past Chairman of the Baltimore Council, presided in a charming manner.

Greetings were given by Mrs. Pearl Bensel Bittorf, outgoing Chairman of the Council; by Miss Hilda W. Chapple, incoming Chairman, and by Miss Hilda Yen of China.

Dr. Margaret Sebree, Secretary of both the World Woman's Party and the National Woman's Party, welcomed the assembly, paying hearty tribute to the splendid achievements of the Baltimore group.

She was followed by Miss Katharine A. Norris, Convener, Women's Joint Legislative Committee for Equal Rights, who introduced the prominent guests, some of whom graciously responded.

Miss Katzoff then made the presentation of the following books: *Adams, Kimball & Eaton,* Heroines of the Sky; *Armstrong,* Margaret, Fanny Kemble, A Passionate Victorian; 3 bound volumes of the Baltimore & Ohio Magazine, Annual Women's Number—1927 to date; *Barton,* Betsy, And Now to Live Again; *Baum,* Vicki, Hotel Berlin; *Bingham,* Millicent Todd, Ancestors' Brocades, The Literary Debut of Emily Dickenson; *Curie,* Eve, Madame Curie; *De Gramont,* E., Pomp and Circumstance; *Du Maurier,* Daphne, Hungry Hill; *Grant,* Dorothy Fremont, Margaret Brent Adventurer; *Jameson,* Storm, Journal of Mary Hervy Russell; *Johnson,* Osa, I Married Adventure, the Lives and Adventures of Martin and Osa Johnson; *Landon,* Margaret, Anna and the King of Siam; *Mansfield,* Margery, ed., American Women Poets of 1937; *Reese,* Lizette Woodworth, Little Henrietta; *Sigaud,* Louis A., Belle Boyd Confederate Spy; *Woody,* Thomas, History of Women's Education in the United States.

Miss Downey, the Librarian, received the books with words of appreciation, and was followed by Mrs. Alma Harrison Ambrose, Chairman of the Maryland Branch, who expressed her pride in the members and work of the Baltimore Council.

The address of the afternoon, "Women in Men's Shoes," was given by Miss Margaret Talbott Stevens, Research Librarian of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Introducing her subject with observing stories of how as a child, she played in her father's shoes, Miss Stevens gave an account of women's work with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, beginning with the first scrub woman and coming down to all the variations of work undertaken by women in World War II. She told how this work was described in the Women's Annual Number 3 of the "Baltimore & Ohio Magazine" beginning with 1927 and continuing to the present day. A full set of these magazines were presented to the Library.

Endorsement By Dr. Frank P. Graves

Widely Known Author and Writer

A clear-cut statement for equality of rights for women under the law should, in my opinion, take its place in the National Constitution beside other fundamental guarantees of justice.

The place of women has greatly changed since our Bill of Rights and Constitution set forth their guarantees of liberty.

The Equal Rights Amendment would make it clear throughout the world that the United States practices at home what it proclaims for all mankind.

(Signed) FRANK P. GRAVES,
President, University of the State of New York, and Commissioner of Education, Retired.

Chapultepec Conference

MEXICO CITY, MEXICO, MARCH 6TH, 1945

The women of America on March 7, 1945, forged another step ahead in their struggle for recognition as the equals of men. A resolution for the participation of women in Inter-American Conferences, representing the joint proposals of Mexico and the Dominican Republic, passed Committee III yesterday morning by a vote of acclamation. The project, supported in speeches by Amalia de Castillo Ledon, of Mexico, Congresswoman Edith Norse Rogers, of the United States, and Minerva Bernadino, delegate from the Dominican Republic recommends first, that the legislatures make effective the Declaration of the VIII International Conference of the United States to suppress discriminations for reasons of sex; second, that the governments of the American nations set aside an annual quota, in proportion to their respective populations, to sustain the International Commission of Women as integral part of the Pan American Union.

The International Commission of Women has worked since its foundation to secure political rights for women, but previously was not accorded a role as a part of the Pan-American Union.

In a speech later in the day, before the Plenary Session, Senorita Bernadino pointed out that before the present war, women enjoyed the right to vote in 44 countries of Europe, Asia, Australia and America.

Among those of America, she said, are the United States, Ecuador, Brazil, Uruguay, Cuba, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Panama and Guatemala. Municipal suffrage has been granted to the women of Chile, Peru, Venezuela and some provinces of the Argentine, she declared, and Colombia only a few months ago gave them the right to citizenship.

Women Are Named Diplomats

Though many countries of Latin America have passed reforms in favor of women's rights, there are still, she pointed out, nations in which graduate lawyers are restricted by law from practicing their profession.

Women can hold diplomatic posts in the United States, and that nation, Brazil, Uruguay and the Dominican Republic have designated women as Plenipotentiary Delegates to Inter-American conferences. Peru, Paraguay, Cuba and Brazil have also appointed women advisors of their delegations.

"To Mexico," she declared, "goes the honor of having been the first country of Latin America to designate a woman as Minister Plenipotentiary, who later formed a part of the Mexican delegation to the League of Nations."

She pointed out that Chile, Mexico, Cuba and Panama have assigned women to their embassies, and Panama was first to send a woman to New York as Consul General. Cuba, she said, was the first country in America to have a woman Cabinet member and also has more women in the Consular Service of the Republic.

Of the countries which have conceded the vote to women, only Uruguay, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and the United States have feminine representation in Congress, she asserted.

The Dominician Republic offers no problem to women, according to Senorita Bernadino, since women enjoy the same civil and political rights as men.

"The Inter-American Commission of Women, since its creation in 1928, has made all these conquests," she declared, "and has had the collaboration of the foreign ministers among whom is Foreign Minister Padilla, whose enthusiastic and understanding help has given the Commission new impulse."

"The extraordinary co-operation of woman in the present conflict, their struggles and their sacrifices, on the battle fronts and in the factories shows that she knows as well as man what war means and what victory costs," she declared.

She lauded the Mexican woman, who though without recognition of her rights, has occupied posts of great responsibility, enlarging her cause with her extraordinary capacity for action and sacrifice.

"The man of Mexico today, as yesterday, is and ought to be convinced that the co-operation of the woman is indispensable for the aggrandizement of the nation in all ways, since her co-operation was equally indispensible for the creation of the nationality and the achievement of Mexican independence."

From Excelsior, Mexico City, March 7, 1945.

RECEIPTS — NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, March 1 to April 30, 1945

Finance Chairman Florence A. Armstrong *Treasurer* Laura Berrien

CONTRIBUTIONS AND MEMBERSHIP FEES

Mrs. Lloyd Williams, N. Y.	$ 500.00
Delaware Branch N. W. P., Delaware	100.00
Mrs. Elon Huntington Hooker, N. Y.	100.00
Mrs. Mary McHenry Keith, Calif.	100.00
Mrs. Phoebe Munnecke, Mich.	75.00
Mrs. William Kent, Calif.	60.00
Mrs. Grace Whiting Huntington, N. Y.	50.00
Mrs. Alice F. Schott, N. Y.	50.00
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.	50.00
D. C. Branch	25.00
Mrs. Josephine N. Keal, Mich.	25.00
Mrs. Katherine Loeser, Calif.	25.00
Mrs. Mark C. Neill, Ill.	25.00
Mrs. Worthington Scranton, Pa.	25.00
Miss Iva Sellers, Pa.	25.00
Mr. Cushing Smith, Mich.	25.00
Mrs. George Vickers, Jr., N. J.	25.00
Miss Agnes Wells, Ind.	20.00
Dr. Miriam Oatman, D. C.	16.00
Miss Marie Louise Bennett, D. C.	15.00
Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, D. C.	15.00
Mrs. Caroline L. Babcock, D. C.	12.00
Mrs. Elizabeth August, Ohio	10.00
Mrs. Edwin F. Bennett, Wyo.	10.00
Miss Laura M. Berrien, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy, Va.	10.00
Mrs. Ada S. Bryson, N. J.	10.00
Mrs. Mary C. Heldring Bye, N. Y.	10.00
Dr. Mildred Dickerson, D. C.	10.00
Miss Mary E. Downey, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Elva Dulmage, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Edith C. Eckert, Md.	10.00
Mrs. Florence T. Edwards, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Anna K. Frazer, D. C.	10.00
Miss Jane Grant, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Lucia V. Grimes, Mich.	10.00
Miss Harriet Holther, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Arthur C. Holden, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Sophia Kenyon, Fla.	10.00
Mrs. Florence L. C. Kitchelt, Conn.	10.00
Judge Anna M. Kross, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Philip Liebmann, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Katherine Link, Mich.	10.00
Mrs. Amy Luden, D. C.	10.00
Miss Criena Mahoney, D. C.	10.00
Miss Alice Matthews, D. C.	10.00
Miss Mary Burt Messer, Calif.	10.00
Mrs. Katherine Nedamire, Calif.	10.00
Mrs. Jean Daggett Paul, Pa.	10.00
Mrs. Amy Powell, N. Y.	10.00
Miss Minnie Reed, Calif.	10.00
St. Margaret's School, Conn.	10.00
Mrs. Edith E. Spaeth, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Vivian M. Walkup, Iowa	10.00
Mrs. J. B. Waterman, Ala.	10.00
Mrs. Lillian S. Welch, Ohio	10.00
Mrs. Josepha Whitney, Conn.	10.00
Dr. Marion P. Whitney, Conn.	10.00
Miss Hilda Yen, D. C.	7.00
Mrs. Marian Albee Clausen, N. Y.	7.00
Mrs. Carl E. Grammer, N. J.	6.00
Mrs. Dorothy D. Granger, Md.	5.00
Mrs. Elsie Bailey, Mich.	5.00
Miss Vina Betterly, Fla.	5.00
Miss Frances M. Boos, N. Y.	5.00
Mrs. A. L. Brooks, Mich.	5.00
Mrs. Edna L. Capewell, N. Y.	5.00
Mrs. Violet W. Dunham, Fla.	5.00
Mrs. Genevieve M. Fuller, Mass.	5.00
Mrs. Lucretia Hayden, Iowa	5.00
Mrs. Sophie Hein, Minn.	5.00
Miss Katherine Jones, Mass.	5.00
Miss Evelyn Kenison, Mass.	5.00
Mrs. Nellie Lamiman, Mich.	5.00
Mrs. Roslyn C. Levinson, Del.	5.00
Mrs. Clara B. Lyberger, Ore.	5.00
Mrs. Inez B. Madsen, Minn.	5.00
Dr. Nina A. Mangas, Mich.	5.00
Miss Carol L. Marx, Minn.	5.00
Miss Grace L. Merriam, N. Y.	5.00
Miss Helen Merriam, N. Y.	5.00
Mrs. Lillian B. Meyers, Ill.	5.00
Mrs. Lucille E. Michie, Va.	5.00
Mrs. Flora E. Miller, Ohio	5.00
Dr. Helen Pearce, Ore.	5.00
Mrs. W. P. Perdue, Fla.	5.00
Mrs. Myrtle L. Petrie, Wash.	5.00
Dr. Louise Pound, Neb.	5.00
Mrs. F. S. Salisbury, Calif.	5.00
Mrs. Lillie H. M. Slemmons, Fla.	5.00
Mrs. Teresa Speed, R. I.	5.00
Miss Doris Stevens, N. Y.	5.00
Mr. Longley Taylor, Ill.	5.00
Mrs. Elizabeth C. Tomlinson, Mass.	5.00
Mrs. Helen C. Veale, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Mabel M. White, Va.	5.00
Mrs. Zaio A. Woodford, Mich.	5.00
Mrs. Mary D. McCain, R. I.	4.00
Miss Marjorie Varner, Fla.	4.00
Miss Florence Maude Andrews, N. Y.	3.00
Mrs. William R. Key, Md.	3.00
Dr. Cora T. Randall, Ohio	3.00
Mrs. Mary H. Mitchell, N. Y.	3.00
Miss Jeanette Marks, N. Y.	2.80
Dr. Mary E. Glover, Calif.	2.50
Mrs. Pearl H. Krahnke, Va.	2.50
Miss Lelia L. Dame, N. Y.	2.00
Mrs. Ethel M. Harza, Mich.	2.00
Mrs. Anna Manus Jacobi, N. Y.	2.00
Mrs. Sophie T. Keer, Pa.	2.00
Mrs. Elsa S. Lull, D C.	2.00
Mrs. Lucy Karr Milburn, N. Y.	2.00
Mrs. Gwendolen B. Penniman, Calif.	2.00
Dr. Inez C. Philbrick, Ohio	2.00
Miss Maude M. Slawson, Ohio	2.00
Miss Anna Kalfus Spero, Calif.	2.00
Miss Ruth Temple, N. Y.	2.00
Miss Lizabeth Wiley, Wyo.	2.00
Miss Ethel Dietrich, D. C.	1.50
Anonymous	1.00
Anonymous	1.00
Miss Ruth D. Choate, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Esther Cloward, N. Y.	1.00
Mrs. Marie Costello, Fla.	1.00
Miss Mertie Farquhar, D. C.	1.00
Miss Edythe Ferris, Pa.	1.00
Miss Augusta Hirschberg, Pa.	1.00
Mrs. Clement M. Johnston, Va.	1.00
Miss M. Davina Johnston, N. Y.	1.00
Mary Kumpf, Conn.	1.00
Miss Grace E. Lamphear, N. Y.	1.00
Mr. Benjamin Leighton, Mass.	1.00
Mrs. Mabel LeMaster, Ohio	1.00
Mrs. Annie Leyandecker, Texas	1.00
Mrs. Faun A. Lindemath, Pa.	1.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Linsley, Pa.	1.00
Lt. Col. Agnes McKernan, N. Y.	1.00
Mrs. Alice Park, Calif.	1.00
Mrs. James Payant, Md.	1.00
Mrs. Emma G. Preston, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Wm. Purvis, Ohio	1.00
Mrs. Mary G. Schaefer, Calif.	1.00
Miss Louise F. Spoor, Calif.	1.00
Miss Elsie L. Stebbings, Calif.	1.00
Mrs. Mildred Taylor, Calif.	1.00
Mrs. Anna C. Trasoff, Pa.	1.00
Miss Naomi Wheeler, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Helen Girvin, Calif.	.75
Miss Freeda Harrold, N. H.	.75
Mrs. Anne Rayer, D. C.	.50
Total contributions and membership fees	$2,011.30

ENROLLMENT FEES

Miss Cary Abercrombie, D. C.; Miss Audrith B. Arnold, Md.; Mrs. Ella Ripley Barnwell, N. C.; Miss Mary Beardslee, Kan.; Mrs. Ed. Bower, N. C.; Edna E. Briggs, N. Y.; Mrs. Marie K. Collens, Ariz.; Delaware Branch (29); Miss Elna Dulmage, N. Y.; Mrs. Albert Durham, N. C.; Mrs. Irene M. Finley, W. Va.; Mrs. John S. Forrest, N. C.; Mrs. Fannie A. From, Md.; Mrs. Betty Hannigan, Ariz.; Mrs. Anne J. Holland, Md.; Mrs. Forrest Hunter, N. C.; Mrs. R. R. Huntzinger, Texas; Indiana Branch (59); Mrs. Pleda Jackson, N. C.; Mrs. Golner H. Kimmel, D. C.; Mrs. Eva Kisor, Va.; Mrs. Clair G. Knox, Nev.; Mrs. Helen McKellar, Calif.; Thelma McQuade, Ariz.; Mrs. Ruth H. Miller, Md.; Francis Willard Munds, Ariz.; Mrs. Mae Norton, Calif.; Mrs. Irene Palotay, Calif.; N. Bess Prather, Ariz.; Mrs. P. F. Patton, N. C.; Mrs. Priscilla M. Pitch, N. Y.; Maymie D. Rayburn, N. Y.; Mrs. Temple Robinson, N. C.; Mrs. Myrtle Steulke, Calif.; Mrs. Geo. A. Waddle, N. C.; Mrs. C. R. Whitaker, N. C.; Mrs. Ed. White, N. C.; Mrs. Roland Whitmire, N. C.; Mrs. Geo. Wing, Jr., N. C.; Miss Connie Work, N. C.; Mrs. Gene Work, D. C.; Adah J. Zolitsch, N. Y

Total enrollment fees $ 32.00

OTHER RECEIPTS

Income from Investment and Endowment	$1,050.00	
Rent of Rooms at National Headquarters	741.50	
Subscription to Equal Rights	228.25	
Contribution for Airplane Tickets to California (San Francisco Conference)	458.16	
Sale of Literature, Postcards and Stamps	20.30	
Receipts from Telephone	3.48	
Sale of Radio Disc	7.50	
Finance Committee (Supper)	4.10	
Total miscellaneous receipts		$2,513.29
GRAND TOTAL, Receipts		$4,556.59

Have you paid your subscription for 1945? Only $1.50!

A Feminist Thinks It Over

By ALMA LUTZ

Biological Difference Not An Obstacle To Justice

WHEN all other arguments against the advancement of women fail, some men and even some women fall back fanatically on the biological differences between men and women. Often we who believe in equal rights for men and women are accused of pretending that these differences do not exist and of trying to "amend Nature" with the Equal Rights Amendment. We of course acknowledge these biological differences but we do not find them an obstacle to justice or to progress for women. Experience, education, and science have proved that these differences do not necessarily rule women out of intelligence, courage, endurance, vision, or the ability to progress; nor do they rule them out of the basic rights acknowledged as a matter of course for men. That is why biological difference cannot rule women out of a constitutional guarantee of equal justice with men under the law.

This old argument of biological difference has been used vigorously against every forward step that women have taken—against higher education, against woman suffrage, professional and business opportunities, and advancement in government and now against the Equal Rights Amendment. It has been dressed up with fine phrases for every new occasion, but always it is a wolf in sheep's clothing. The arguments against higher education for women sound ridiculous to us today, although they were swallowed whole in Fascist countries not so long ago. They were advanced with the utmost seriousness by well-meaning educators, scholars, statesmen, and women and continued in one form or another until the end of the century. Because of biological differences, ran the argument, women are unable to comprehend the higher studies; they may be able to memorize but never, never can they reason. Therefore mathematics, the sciences, and philosophy are utterly beyond them, and for their role in life, higher education is useless. When a few women proved all this to be untrue, the biological difference group brought forth another set of arguments which they were sure would be irrefutable. Women's health, they said, could never stand the strain of higher education and as a result women would be unable to bear children and the future of the race was threatened. Books were published to try to prove these theories and awaken the public to the impending dangers. Some clergymen even argued that the higher education of women defied the will of God. But none of these arguments could stem the tide of progress.

Nevertheless these same old arguments are appearing again in modern dress, translated into high-sounding scientific phrases, sugar-coated with benevolence and public welfare. Now they are directed against the Equal Rights Amendment. There are still advocates of the biological-difference theory writing books to show women's inability to do this and that and their frustration because they try to do something besides bear children. There are still statesmen, so called, who feel they are keeping women on a pedestal and protecting them by refusing to acknowledge the dignity of the individual woman and her right to equal justice with men under the law. There are still women who like to cling to the chronic-invalid theory in order to avoid responsibility.

But progress points in the other direction—toward freedom of choice and opportunity for women, toward equal rights under the law. Biological-difference arguments may delay progress a little but they cannot stop it. Progress demands that the basic principles of justice for women be written into the Constitution, in their Bill of Rights, the Equal Rights Amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT
Concerning
BIENNIAL CONFERENCE

By CECIL NORTON BROY
Convention Chairman

Owing to the death of President Roosevelt, the Executive Committee postponed the Convention which had been scheduled for April 19th and 20th. The Meeting will be held at Belmont House, 144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C., on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, July 19th, 20th and 21st.

The program follows:

Thursday, July 19th

Registration at 10 A. M. and continuing throughout the day.

Interviews with Members of Congress.

Committee Meetings.

8 P. M. Meeting celebrating the 97th Anniversary of the First Equal Rights Convention held at Seneca Falls, N. Y., on July 19th and 20th, 1848. In the garden at headquarters.

REV. WEALTHY HONSINGER FISHER, presiding.

Friday, July 20th

10 A. M. Business Meeting.

2 P. M. Business Meeting.
Report from Woman's Party representatives at United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

8 P. M. Conference on final drive for Amendment in Congress. Chairman—Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Congressional Chairman. Discussion led by Senator George L. Radcliffe, of Maryland, Chief Sponsor in the Senate, and Representative Louis Ludlow, of Indiana, Chief Sponsor in the House of Representatives.

Saturday, July 21st

10 A. M. Business Meeting. Election of Officers and National Council.

2 P. M. Business Meeting.

4 P. M. Presentation of Portraits given to Woman's Party. Announcement of other Gifts and Pledges followed by Tea. Chairman of Arrangements, Dr. Margaret Sebree.

8 P. M. Meeting of Newly-elected Council.